

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8 and 11 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 1-2, 5 and 7 are amended; Claim 4 is canceled; and Claim 11 is added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 4 was rejected on the grounds of non-statutory double patenting; and Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,808,352 to Seita in view of U.S. Publication 2003/0141217 to Park.

With respect to the double patenting rejection over copending application 10/706,977, the present amendment amends Claim 1 to recite that the door member contacts the inside of the chamber. This feature is not recited in Claim 1 of the 10/706,977 application. Withdrawal of the rejection for double patenting doctrine is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Claim 1 recites in part, that i) the door member has an edge portion and another edge portion wherein in a condition where said door member closes the first opening, the edge portion that contacts an inside wall of said chamber overlaps a peripheral portion of said first opening; and ii) another edge portion forms an aperture (the chink 1 in Fig. 2) defined by an edge of said first opening and said another edge portion of said door member, the inside of said chamber gas fluidically communicates with the outside of said chamber through the aperture. These features are not taught or suggested in the applied art.

In particular, Seita merely discusses a chamber; a first opening to access an inside of a clean box storing a wafer and a door 32 to hold a lid 2 of the clean box. Seita fails to disclose an edge portion that contacts an inside wall of said chamber to overlap a peripheral portion of

said first opening in a condition where said door member closes the first opening. In Fig. 2 of Seita, protrusion 9 is a member to engage with the clean box and does not correspond to the edge portion that contacts an inside wall of said chamber to overlap a peripheral portion of said first opening as recited in the claimed invention.

Park also discusses a chamber; a first opening to access an inside of a clean box storing a wafer and a cover 104 for closing the container 102. As such, Park also fails to disclose an edge portion that contacts an inside wall of said chamber to overlap a peripheral portion of said first opening in a condition where said door member closes first opening.

In addition, Seita and Park fail to disclose that in the condition where the door member closes the first opening, another portion of a door forms an aperture defined by an edge of the first opening and the another edge portion of the door member, the inside of the chamber gas fluidically communicating with the outside of the chamber through the aperture. That is, both Seita and Park fail to disclose a portion corresponding to the aperture (chink 1 in Fig. 2 of the present application). Therefore, neither Seita nor Park, either alone or in combination, discloses all the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the claimed invention is not obvious over Seita in view of Park.

New Claim 11 recites in part i) an outer shape of said door member is larger than said first opening to cover a whole part of said first opening from the inside of said chamber; and ii) in a condition where said door member closes said first opening, said door member has a through aperture (numeral 13 of Fig. 7 of the present application) to gas fluidically communicate between the inside and the outside of said chamber through the aperture within an area in the outer shape of said door member. For example, in Figures 6, 9 and 10A to 10D and the corresponding discussion in Seita, there is no teaching or suggestion for the above discussed features. Similarly, Park fails to disclose an outer shape of said door member is larger than said first opening to cover a whole part of said first opening from the inside of


said chamber, and wherein in a condition where said door member closes said first opening, said door member has a through aperture to gas fluidically communicate between the inside and the outside of said chamber through the aperture within an area in the outer shape of said door member. Please see Figures 6A and 6B and the corresponding discussion in Park. Accordingly, in Seita and Park, the door member does not cover a first opening.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Robert T. Pous
Registration No. 29,099

Kevin M. McKinley
Registration No. 43,794

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)